

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

**Amendments to the Claims**

Enclosed is a Substitute Specification listing the amended Claims.

**Specification and Abstract**

New application papers for the Specification and Abstract are enclosed, amended solely to reflect Examiner's suggestion to re-name "rear hosel extension".

**Information Disclosure Statement**

An amended substitute Information Disclosure Statement is enclosed as a separate paper distinct from Specification with two unnecessary foreign citations removed.

1. a. **Substitute Page 1 of Specification**

Page 1 of the Specification is being resubmitted per 714, Section II of MPEP conforming to 608.01(a) of MPEP with name, assignment, filing date, international classification and field of search removed as shown in the enclosed Substitute Specification.

b. **Term "rearward hosel extension" Corrected**

Applicant notes Examiner's confusion in both 4/8/05 "initial" and 10/13/05 "final" Office Action over the term "rearward hosel extension" used within the Specification and Claims. Applicant's 8/3/05 response to the initial Office Action and amended Claims and Specification attempted to clarify, apparently unsuccessfully, this term. (See 8/3/05 para 6-8, pg. 3-4 "...the rearward hosel connection does not function as a hosel...this

non-hosel...”) Applicant, therefore, amends the Specification, Claims, and Abstract with the term “rearward putterhead extension with sight line” (of the forward extending hosel sight line) solely for purposes of this clarification. Applicant herein and previously (8/3/05 response) concurs with Examiner that there can only be one hosel (which has always had a forward extending section in the subject invention). The former “rearward hosel extension” now called the “rearward putterhead extension with sight line” or “rearward sight line” was never intended to be a second hosel, but rather an extension of the forward extending hosel sight line, thereby resulting in a combined total sight line length greater or longer than any prior art while conforming to the Rules. Maximum Rules conforming unobstructed sight line length, for improved aim accuracy, is the primary object of the present invention.

Applicant hopes the enclosed wording changes to the Specification and Claims, which in no manner change the subject invention, assist the Examiner in his understanding of the invention.

2-4. Examiner Accepts

Examiner’s acceptances are noted.

5. Re-Copy for Foreign Patents 2255287 and 1,129,313

These foreign patents are not relevant and are being removed from the substitute Information Disclosure Statement enclosed.

6. Examiner Accepts

Examiner’s acceptances noted.

**7-8. Rejection of Claims 1-8 and 11 Under 35 USC 112, para 7 as "indefinite"**

The Specification, Claims and Abstract have been amended and clarified by removing the term "rearward hosel extension" and replacing it with the term "rearward putterhead extension with sight line" or "rearward sight line" on a rearward extension of the putterhead body.

The Claim 1 wording "said hosel being in a vertical plane normal to said strikeface, before connecting to said golf ball shaft on the player side of and not in said vertical plane" has been amended to remove Examiner noted confusion ("if not in said vertical plane of said hosel where is it?"). The hosel now is described with a "forward extending hosel section" and a "shaft connecting hosel section with socket or other shaft connecting means" located to the player's side of said hosel plane.

Claims 3-6 indefiniteness is corrected as follows:

Claim 3 is amended and describes a specific shape for the "shaft connecting hosel section" of Claim 1 or bent shaft section without visually interrupting or distracting from the sight line of Claim 1. It does not claim a new or alternate forward extending hosel section.

Claim 4 as amended only describes and claims the width limits of the sight lines on top of both the Claim 1 forward extending hosel section and the Claim 1 rearward putterhead extension.

Claim 5 as amended is dependent on Claim 4 and describes the color or finish of both sight lines and the color of the "shaft connecting hosel section" or alternative bent shaft section lying above a golf ball contacting said strikepoint. It does not claim a new or alternate forward extending hosel section.

Claim 6 dependent on Claim 1, as amended, only describes the color or finish of that portion of the shaft connecting hosel extension or bent shaft section and lower putter shaft not lying above a golf ball when viewed from above contacting or near the

strikepoint. It does not claim a new or alternate forward extending hosel section. If a bent shaft is used, a shaft connecting hosel section, in the form of either a socket or slip over rod (as used in Figs. 1-7), and a means of connecting the socket or rod to said "forward extending hosel section" is still required.

**9-10. Claim 3 Rejection Under 35 USC 112 para 1, "enablement"**

The amended language in the Specification and Claims 1 and 3 which now break the "hosel" (which the USGA describes as the straight shaft to putterhead connection means, limited to 5 inch total length) into two distinct sections (plus shaft connecting socket or rod), the "forward extending hosel section" and the "shaft connecting hosel section." Elements 3 and 4 in Figs. 1 and 3 or elements 13 and 14 in Figs. 4 and 6 should enable anyone to measure the claimed 1/4 to 1 ball diameter. See also in the amended Specification under Preferred Embodiments, para 2, describing Figures 4, 5, and 6 (first 3 sentences).

**11-12. Claims 1-2 and 8 Rejected Under 35 USC 103(a) (obvious) Over Stone In View of Sneed and Perkins or Gebhardt**

Neither Stone, nor Sneed nor Perkins nor Gebhardt individually or in combination have both the vertical plane "forward extending hosel section" which never goes rearward in combination with the much longer "rearward putterhead extension with sight line" of the present invention. Because of the rearward and then forward hosel bends of Stone, Sneed and Perkins, they can not conform with the maximum 5 inch sole plate to hosel socket top (or start of straight putter shaft) hosel path length required to conform with the Rules of Golf (USGA). Gebhardt's forward (Fig. 8) or rearward (Fig. 1) extending hosel (never both) also fails with excessive length. The long "goose neck"

hosels of all four also produce excessive undesirable impact vibrations (like a tuning fork).

There are also numerous other major and obvious differences between Stone, Sneed, Perkins or Gebhardt and the present invention. All have round or horizontally wide or flat (Stone) hosels vs the vertical plane oriented thin sections of the "forward extending hosel sections" and "rearward putterhead extension with sight line" of the present invention. This additional restriction could be added to Claim 1, should Examiner require same, but should not be necessary for the reasons stated and the amended Claims presented herein.

Stone's hosel is not vertical, but wide and horizontal and twisted (Fig. 2) toward the golfer and tapered (Fig. 5) making the far top edge (which is not on the putterhead centerline) unsuitable as a sight line. Sneed does not improve or make obvious Stone as both have hosels which go substantially rearward first before going forward, hence the hosels do not proceed "forward, and not substantially rearward" from the strikepoint and strikeface (as in Claim 1 as amended). Perkins differs little from Sneed in this regard and has the hosel plane offset (not vertical) and not through a strikepoint in the center of the strikeface (Figs. 1-3 and 5-6).

It is noteworthy that the Examiner did not raise Stone, Sneed or Perkins in the 4/8/05 initial Office Action and made this second Office Action of 10/13/05 final before allowing Applicant to respond to same.

13. Claim 3 Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) (obvious) Over Stone in view of Sneed and Perkins or Gebhardt (as per 12 above) and Meyer

Claim 3 is dependent on independent Claim 1 as amended, which Applicant believes now transcends Stone, Sneed, Perkins and Gebhardt for the reasons previously cited above. Meyer discloses a face balanced putter with a hosel section

normal to the vertical centerline plane, but Meyer's normal hosel section does not extend from or connect to a second hosel section in the centerline plane, like the present invention. Meyer's forward extending hosel section extends from the putterhead heel and is therefore visually blocked by the putter shaft making it useless as a sight or aim line.

14. Claim 4 Rejection Under USC 103(a) Over Stone in view of Sneed and Perkins or Gebhardt (as per 1, 2 and 8 above) and Simmons

Claim 4 is dependent on independent Claim 1, as amended, which Applicant believes now transcends Stone, Sneed, Perkins, and Gebhardt for the reasons previously cited above.

While aim lines of .025 to 0.5 inch width are not new to the art, the putterhead of the present invention with its' two combined forward sight line and much larger rearward sight line per Claim 1 is unique and not obvious.

15. Claim 5 Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) Over Stone in view of Sneed, Perkins, Gebhardt and Simmons and further in view of Klein (5,072,941)

Aim lines of a color contrasting with adjacent putterhead members is not new to the art. Light or white coloring of hosel sections lying over a golf ball which is near or contacting the strikepoint is new and unique, not disclosed in Klein or any other citations, and probably independently patentable even if Claim 5 were not dependent on Claim 4, itself dependent on amended Claim 1.

16. Claim 6 Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) Over Stone, Sneed, Perkins or Gebhardt, Simmons and Klein and further Radakovich

Claim 6 as amended, is now dependent on independent Claim 1 as amended (not Claim 5) which Applicant believes now transcends Stone, Sneed, Perkins, Gebhardt, Simmons and Klein for the reasons previously cited above. Dark or black golf shafts are not new to the art, but none have been disclosed or claimed or used in conjunction with the unique putterhead of independent Claim 1, as amended.

17. Claim 7 Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) over Stone, Sneed, Perkins, Gebhardt, Simmons and further Byrne

While use of partial or full circumference aim lines marked on golf balls are not new to the art, matching the color, width, and appearance of such a ball aim line with a putterhead aim line, especially one extending forward of the putterface, may be new, unique, nonobvious and independently patentable. Combining same with the putterhead of independent Claim 1, as amended, is not obvious via any combination of the art previously cited.

18. Claim 11 Allowable with all Present Limitations if Rewritten to Overcome 35 USC 112, para 1 and 2 Rejections

In the Specification (4th para of Description of Preferred Embodiments), approximately 10 lines describe a preferred embodiment where a ball width sighting field is centered about said sight lines reducing the necessary optical distraction of a golf ball at address directly in front of the strikepoint by making said ball optically part of a longer sighting field. Claim 11 is amended to conform with USC 112, but remains dependent on Claim 4, itself dependent on amended Claim 1 which Applicant believes is now in condition for allowance.

**19-20. Examiner's Response to Applicant's Arguments and Move to Final Action**

Applicant's three added lines to the Specification solely to respond to Examiner's stated USC 112 confusion over a "rearward hosel extension" (Examiner states "How can a hosel extend forward and rearward") and amended claims to address same confusion, and did not expand or substantially alter claimed material.

Examiner's second Office Action provided no explanation for how these minor amendments made for Examiner's benefit and/or at Examiner's suggestion necessitated new grounds of rejection and, therefore, a Final Action.

**21. Prior Art of Record and Doran's Forward and Rearward Hosel Extension**

Doran, while not relied upon in Examiner's Office Actions, nor any other prior art cited, does not disclose a "forward and rearward hosel extension", but rather a "horizontal alignment bar segment perpendicular to said shaft" (i.e. shaft is vertical), only a small part of which is used as a hosel section. Unlike the present invention, the rearward extension is short (one half ball diameter or less vs one or more of present invention) and is not an integral part of the putterhead body (not the "rearward putterhead extension" of the present invention). It is not "in solid communication with the bottom sole" per the present invention. It, therefore, does not conform with the Rules of Golf which "prohibit appendages solely for aim or alignment purposes." Because the shaft is vertical (also against the Rules) and on the "alignment bar", the entire shaft blocks the sight line.



22. Conclusion

Applicant respectfully maintains that the amended claims in this Amendment After Final are in a condition for allowance and respectfully requests consideration and allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'John W. Rohrer', written in a cursive style.

John W. Rohrer

Rohrer Technologies, Inc.  
5 Long Cove Road  
York, ME 03909  
(207) 363-5502